

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4, 6-17 and 19-27 are all the claims that are pending in the application. Claims 14-16, 19, 20, 22 and 24 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-4, 6-10, 17 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dautartas et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,582,548; hereinafter “Dautartas”). Claims 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dautartas in view of Ainslie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,534,811; hereinafter “Ainslie”). Claims 11-13 are allowed. Applicant respectfully submits the following in traversal of the claim rejections.

Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-10, 17 and 25-27 under § 102(e) by Dautartas

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is believed to be patentable because Dautartas fails to disclose or suggest a compression bonding method wherein the light provides activating energy which allows an interaction between the layer and the element approximately at room temperature. Although the Examiner alleges that “heating is only disclosed as optional . . . ,” in Dautartas, and that “room temperature would be the conditions under which bonding would occur if not desired,” we disagree. Paragraph 9, at page 5.

Dautartas makes no mention of the localized laser providing activating energy which allows an interaction between the oxide member and the aluminum layer approximately at room temperature. Col. 3, lines 14-51. Rather, the entirety of Dautartas suggests that a heated interface is required between the oxide member and the aluminum layer. See Abstract, col. 2, lines 22-23 and col. 3, lines 35-39, lines 43-49. Further, the Examiner does not “provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic,” i.e., the interaction between the oxide member and the aluminum layer

occurs at room temperature, “necessarily flows from the teachings” of Dautartas. See MPEP §2112(IV). Therefore, the Examiner cannot reasonably characterize the disclosure of Dautartas as disclosing the compression bonding method as recited in claim 1. See id.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is believed to be patentable.

For reasons similar to those submitted for claim 1, claim 17 is believed to be patentable.

Claims 2, 3, 6-10, 25 and 26, which depend from claim 1, and claim 27, which depends from claim 17, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for their respective base claims.

Claim 4 is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons submitted in the Amendment of January 24, 2006.

Rejection of Claims 21 and 23 under § 103(a) over Dautartas in view of Ainslie

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 21 and 23 are patentable because a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established. In the Office Action, the Examiner concedes that Dautartas does not disclose the use of light in the UV wavelength range, but cites Ainslie as disclosing the use of UV light. Applicant submits that one skilled in the art would not combine the teachings of Dautartas with Ainslie.

Dautartas teaches that there are significant drawbacks in heating supports at temperatures between 350 ° and 400 ° C because such high temperatures adversely affect the solder bonds used to bond the optoelectronic device to the support. Col. 1, line 66 - col. 2, line 6. The method disclosed by Ainslie, however, involves high temperatures, e.g., 1250° C, which would effectively melt the solder bonds of Dautartas. Therefore, the combination of Dautartas with Ainslie would render Dautartas unsatisfactory for its intended purpose of providing a bonding scheme at temperatures much lower than those taught by Ainslie.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116  
U.S. APPLN. NO.: 10/632,919

ATTY DOCKET NO.: Q75814

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
Seok-Won Stuart Lee  
Limited Recognition No. L0212

Date: July 5, 2006